

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/675,276

Applicant(s)

BANDEKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher A. Daley

Art Unit

2111

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher A. Daley. (3) _____.

(2) Anthany Miologos (29677). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,3,11,12,13,21,22, and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The limitation of claim 2 would be incorporated in claim 1 to distinguish application over prior art. Limitation of claim 12 would be incorporated in claim 11 to distinguish application over prior art. Limitation of claim 22 would be incorporated in claim 21 to distinguish application over prior art. The dependency of claim 3 would be claim 1. The dependency of claim 13 would be claim 11. The dependency of claim 23 would be claim 21. Claims 2, 12, and 22 would be cancelled. These changes would be implemented via an examiner's amendment.